

From: [David Moehring](#)
To: [PRC; DOT LA; DOT SeattleTrees; Torgelson, Nathan](#)
Cc: [seattle-tree-ordinance-working-grouplists.riseup.net](#); [McElroy, Shanyanika](#); [Pinto de Bader, Sandra](#); [Herbold, Lisa](#); [neighborhoodtreekeepers@gmail.com](#)
Subject: Clearcutting Tree Grove abutting Kubota Garden (9666 51st Ave S)
Date: Sunday, October 27, 2019 4:07:53 PM
Attachments: [ATT00001.png](#)
Importance: High

CAUTION: External Email

Thank you for allowing public comment on the **9666 51st Ave S**. With at least **50 requests to PRC@seattle.gov**, please hold a public meeting to review the environmental and landuse issues of the proposed clear-cutting of a large wooded lot bordering Kubota Gardens.

This is yet another reason why Seattle needs a stronger tree ordinance.



Parcel 7131300100; Owned by Amerinor Holding, Lot area 62,726 sq ft

FACTS:

- A tribe sent in a public comment asking that the dam be removed to protect the fish population. Besides the dam on this property, there are 4 other dams, all within 200 feet of each other, 2 up stream and 2 downstream, and on Parks property.
- Another Correction letter requires the plans be revised to indicate the abutting Kubota Gardens Natural Area. The current version merely says there is a park within 100'.
- About 6 years ago another project on the southern boundary of Kubota Garden sought a 29 unit project on 5 acres in a wetland buffer on the upstream edge of the garden on S 55th St.. Fortunately, Seattle Parks purchased the 5 acres from them for \$5 million.

We know of lot subdivisions within Single-Family zone, but since when does SDCI allow selling 9 homes on one 62,726 sq ft lot within a SF-7200 zone? Is the owners at Amerinor Holding looking for a contract rezone from SF-7200 to LR1 in order to allow multiple family dwellings on this lot? Will any of these nine homes be set aside as affordable housing? Is Seattle that desperate to take away more park-like land in lieu of redeveloping run-down existing properties that have no adjacency to a Seattle nature habitat?

It was my understanding that in order to build nine market-rate and unaffordable homes on this deep lot that a subdivision of a lot should be pursued instead on the proposed unit lots. Please review carefully the code sections that are applicable to single-family zones compared to multifamily zones. See that plans of the project that referenced SMC 23.22.062:

<http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/edms/GetDocument.aspx?id=3341073>

This was sent in this Streams report :

<http://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/edms/GetDocument.aspx?id=3318786>

- **SUMMARY OF POINTS FOR THE PUBLIC MEETING IF CALLED FOR BY AT LEAST 50 PEOPLE:**

- This 900' long X 100' wide parcel that crosses Mapes Creek & a Category 4 wetland.
- The September 16th, 2019 Site Plan Cycle 8 for MUP 3018093 shows this project I have been monitoring for a long time has been reactivated.
- This unbuilt natural site is zoned SF7200, but the 9 unit lots in the 1.44 acre site are only 4,000 sq ft. Since when is the 75/80 lot division rule ignored for lots like this?
- A 1-31-19 Corrections letter from Parks asks if the applicant considered a deed to the city for the creek area on the east side of the site. They would like to own it as done adjacent to this lot. Why is the City willing to accept a Conservation Easement?
- Parcel F is part of separate lot that appears to be shelved in the current application. Parcel F was previously included in a design that did not have adequate driveway turn radius's for fire trucks, due to the narrow 100' width of the majority of the site.
- What enforcement is being pursued by SDCI on the existig tree grove and two Exceptional trees? The plans only mention 1 of the Exceptional Trees, and does NOT mention the Grove, but they are not close to each other. Both Exceptional trees are extra large, and thus are deal-breakers in the existing design. Each of the trees would cost an entire lot to save.

To quote the Arborist Report, the forest is so dense that plotting the trees on the plan 'presents real problems'. So does that warrant the arborist to avoid plotting any trees?

David Moehring
TreePAC and concerned Seattle resident.

Let's build a community by following the Codes.